



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE RELATION OF SPENSER AND HARVEY TO PURITANISM

The relation of Spenser to Puritanism has been discussed by various investigators during recent years. Some of the writers do not recognize the fact that, even if we can make sure that Spenser was a "Puritan," our inquiry is then only begun, not ended. For the words "Puritan" and "Puritanism" covered a very wide range of meaning. A recent paper by Professor F. M. Padelford brings this out with great clearness. He points out that the employment of these terms in sixteenth-century England resembles the indiscriminating use of the words "socialist" and "socialism" at the present time. He says:

Such diverse personalities as Archbishop Grindal, Bishop Cox, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Philip Sidney, and Thomas Cartwright are all denominated Puritans, or credited with Puritan sympathies. Yet Grindal regarded Cartwright as a dangerous fellow who was poisoning the minds of the young men of Cambridge; Bishop Cox did not hesitate to class the Puritans with the Papists as very anti-Christ; and, to borrow a suggestion from Matthew Arnold, fancy the distress of Sidney or of Leicester if he had found himself confined for a three months to the "Mayflower," with only the Pilgrim Fathers for a solace! Like "socialism" today, "Puritanism" in the sixteenth century was a relative matter.¹

A favorite opinion in recent years has been that Spenser was an extreme Puritan, presumably a Presbyterian at heart. He must have had some contact with the great Presbyterian leader of that day, Thomas Cartwright, who returned to Cambridge as Margaret professor of divinity in 1569, the very year when Spenser entered the University, matriculating at Pembroke Hall. The view that Spenser was an extreme Puritan is advocated by James Russell Lowell,² Lilian Winstanley,³ and James Jackson Higginson.⁴

¹ "Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda," *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 85-106.

² "Spenser," *Prose Works*, Vol. IV, Riverside ed., Boston.

³ "Spenser and Puritanism," *Mod. Lang. Quar.*, III, 6-16, 103-10.

⁴ *Spenser's Shepherd's Calender* (Columbia University Press, 1912), pp. 38-162.

That Spenser was Calvinistic in his theology is entirely probable. Miss Winstanley presents evidence in support of the following assertions:

The Church in its earlier days was Calvinistic in its theology, and Puritanism was only an attempt to reduce it to the Calvinistic model in other respects. . . . We may say generally that Spenser accepted the Calvinism which was, as has been pointed out, the common creed of the day.¹

The more recent study of Professor Padelford² confirms these statements.

But I cannot believe that Miss Winstanley is correct when she concludes that Spenser was also opposed to episcopacy: "On the question, then, that was after all the main point at issue in Elizabeth's reign—the question of church discipline—Spenser sided as strongly as possible with the Puritans."³

Dean R. W. Church⁴ and Professor T. W. Hunt⁵ oppose this view. They hold that Spenser was not hostile to episcopacy, but that he favored a purified Anglicanism. This is the opinion of Professor Padelford in an article already cited.⁶

An important piece of evidence was unknown to those writers already mentioned who believed that Spenser was an "out-and-out Puritan,"⁷ that he "threw himself heart and soul into the cause of Cartwright."⁸ In a paper read before the British Academy on November 29, 1907, Dr. Israel Gollancz told of a collection of books of travel bound together which formerly belonged to Gabriel Harvey. One of these books, *The Traveiler of Ierome Turler* (1575), has upon its title-page the following inscription in Harvey's handwriting: *Ex dono Edmundij Spenserij, Episcopi Roffensis [=of Rochester] Secretarij, 1578.*⁹ The reviewer of Higginson's book in the *Nation* for November 21, 1912 (p. 486), comments as follows:

Before this simple fact the whole elaborate structure of Mr. Higginson's interpretation of the tale of the Shepherd Roffy or Roffynn, his dog Lowder,

¹ Pp. 8–9.

² "Spenser and the Theology of Calvin," *Mod. Phil.*, XII, 1–18.

³ P. 16.

⁴ Spenser, "English Men of Letters" series (Macmillan, 1879), *passim*.

⁵ "Edmund Spenser and the English Reformation," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXVII, 39–53.

⁶ "Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda." See above.

⁷ Higginson, p. 152.

⁸ Winstanley, p. 13.

⁹ See *The Athenaeum*, December 7, 1907, p. 732.

and the Wolf, in the September eclogue, virtually crumbles to pieces. The discovery makes it plain that Grosart was right in identifying the shepherd with Young, Bishop of Rochester, who had previously been Master of Pembroke Hall (Spenser's own college) at Cambridge. . . . Still further, Spenser's relations to Young have a direct bearing on Mr. Higginson's theory in regard to the poet's supposed bitter hostility towards Anglicanism. The fact that Spenser was a Puritan in his views—at least in his early life—is not open to serious question; but would a thoroughgoing Anglican like Young have appointed the poet to so confidential a position as that of private secretary if the views of the latter had been so extreme as our author [Higginson] assumes? It is to be remembered that Young had been master of Spenser's college through the whole seven years of the poet's residence there, so that he could not possibly have been ignorant of Spenser's opinions in matters of religious doctrine and church government.

Since the present article was first written, Dr. Percy W. Long has published an important paper upon "Spenser and the Bishop of Rochester."¹ Dr. Long holds that Spenser's "rise from the rank of poor scholar, his moral and ecclesiastical ideas, and much of his early poetry were immediately conditioned by his close affiliation with the Bishop of Rochester."² The facts set forth in the article, many of them newly discovered, make this conclusion entirely probable. Spenser's connection with Bishop Young shows that he cannot have been an extreme Puritan, an enemy of the episcopal system.

I wish to advocate the view that Spenser was always a Low-Churchman. Even in *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Mother Hubberds Tale*, presumably composed at about the same time, there is evidence to confirm this opinion. The three eclogues of the *Calender* which are plainly and primarily concerned with church affairs are those for May, July, and September. In the first two of these Archbishop Grindal is praised under the name of "Algrind" or "Algrin"; in the September eclogue, as we have seen, Bishop Young is praised as "Roffynn," "Roffy." Line 176,

Colin Clout, I wene, be his selfe boye,

seems to mean that Spenser was in Young's employ when this eclogue was written. A well-known line in the April eclogue also (l. 21) applies to Bishop Young and Spenser:

Colin thou kenst, the Southerne shepheardes boye.

¹ *Publications of Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, December, 1916, pp. 713-35. ² P. 735.

We note that Spenser shows very special admiration for Archbishop Grindal in *The Shepheardes Calender*. On June 24, 1569, one month after Spenser matriculated at Cambridge, "Cecil received a letter from Grindal, recently installed as Archbishop of York, who strongly denounced the 'love of contention and liking of novelties' with which he heard that Cartwright had disturbed the University, and advocated his expulsion unless he conformed."¹ Is it likely that Spenser, the admirer of Grindal, favored the views of this same Cartwright, the arch-Presbyterian? Later in this paper we shall find Gabriel Harvey, Spenser's close friend, opposing Cartwright by name.

In a gloss to line 121 of the May eclogue E. K. seems to accept episcopacy as a satisfactory system. There is no good reason to suppose that he is insincere in these words, or that he misrepresents Spenser's meaning. He says:

Some gan, meant of the Pope, and his Anti-christian prelates, which usurpe a tyrannical dominion in the Church, and with Peters counterfet keyes open a wide gate to al wickednesse and insolent government. Nought here spoken, as of purpose to deny fatherly rule and godly governaunce (as some maliciously of late have done, to the great unreste and hinderaunce of the Church) but to displaye the pride and disorder of such as, in steede of feeding their sheepe, indeede feede of theyr sheepe.

I feel confident that "fatherly rule" in this passage applies especially to the rule of the bishops, the spiritual fathers. Professor Padelford so interprets it.² Higginson believes, strangely enough, that those who "maliciously of late" have denied "fatherly rule and governaunce" are "the Anabaptists, with whom the Puritans disclaimed any connection."³

The following lines in *Mother Hubberds Tale* are evidently meant to satirize zealous, solemn-visaged Puritans:

First therefore, when ye have in handsome wise
Yourself attyred, as you can devise,
Then to some Noble man your selfe applye,
Or other great one in the worldes eye,
That hath a zealous disposition
To God, and so to his religion:
There must thou fashion eke a godly zeale,

¹ Higginson, pp. 21-22.

² *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 103.

³ P. 81.

Such as no carpers may contrayre reveale:
 For each thing fained, ought more warie bee.
 There thou must walke in sober gravitee,
 And seeme as Saintlike as Saint *Radegund*:
 Fast much, pray oft, looke lowly on the ground,
 And unto everie one doo curtesie meeke:
 These lookes (nought saying) doo a benefice seeke,
 And be thou sure one not to lacke or long.

[Ll. 487-501.]

Book II of *The Faerie Queene* may well have been written, at least in an early form, before Spenser went to Ireland. Canto II of that book tells us of the sour, discontented Elissa and her like-minded lover, Sir Huddibras, of the "comely courteous dame," Medina, who symbolizes the golden mean, and of the wanton Perissa with her bold lover, Sansloy. Elissa and Sir Huddibras are a plain satire upon the ultra-Puritans. Samuel Butler took from this canto the name of Elissa's lover, Huddibras, for the title of his great satire upon Puritanism, *Hudibras*, and for the name of the central figure.¹ Butler interpreted Spenser's allegory at this point as directed against the extreme Puritans.

Even those who believe that Spenser was an out-and-out Puritan at one time are forced to assume that he changed his views somewhat in later years. Let us look at the passages which compel them to admit this.

Near the end of Book VI of *The Faerie Queene*, published in 1596, one portion of the career of the Blatant Beast is thus described:

From thence into the sacred Church he broke,
 And robd the Chancell, and the deskes downe threw,
 And Altars fouled, and blasphemy spoke,
 And th' Images for all their goodly hew,
 Did cast to ground, whilest none was them to rew;
 So all confounded and disordered there.

[VI, xii, 25.]

Ben Jonson told Drummond that "by the Blating Beast the Puritans were understood."² It is quite certain that it is they who are satirized in these lines.

¹ *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VIII, 73.

² *The Works of Ben Jonson* (Gifford-Cunningham ed.), III, 478.

The writings of Spenser that appeared after his death contain two distinct expressions of antipathy to the Puritan extremists. One of these concerns their manners; the other, their teachings. In the fragments of *The Faerie Queene* which were published in 1609, and which are usually assigned to Book VII, a crab is described as going backward,

as Bargemen wont to fare
Bending their force contrary to their face,
Like that ungracious crew which faines demurest grace.

[Canto vii, stanza 35.]

In his prose *View of the Present State of Ireland*, first printed in 1633, Spenser says concerning the church edifices of that country:

Next care in religion is to builde up and repayre all the ruinous churches . . . for the outward shewe (assure your selfe) doth greatlye drawe the rude people to the reverencing and frequenting thereof, what ever some of our late to nice fooles saye—"there is nothing in the seemelye forme and comely ordere of the church."¹

Lowell, Miss Winstanley, and Mr. Higginson recognize that these passages last quoted show Spenser to have been out of sympathy with ultra-Puritanism during his later years. They all assume that a change has come over him, and suggest reasons for the supposed transformation. But a simpler and more probable view is that there never was any fundamental alteration in Spenser's attitude toward Puritanism, that he always was a Church Puritan, an earnest, zealous Low-Churchman.

The considerations that have so far been presented are not new, but it seemed best to indicate them briefly for the sake of completeness. The main purpose of this paper is to call attention to a source of evidence concerning Spenser's attitude toward Puritanism which has been neglected. The friendship between Edmund Spenser and Gabriel Harvey was so intimate and unclouded that I feel confident of a substantial agreement in their religious views. Harvey has given somewhat full expression to his religious convictions. Can we fairly cite his utterances as representing the opinions of Spenser also?

About the close and life-long sympathy between the two friends there can be no mistake. I have already noted that Spenser made a

¹ *The Globe Spenser*, p. 680; Todd's *Spenser*, VIII, 503-4.

present of Turler's *Traveler* to Harvey in 1578. The Bodleian Library possesses a copy of *Howleglas* which, together with other books, Spenser gave to Harvey conditionally on December 20, 1578. A note by Harvey in the volume records a list of all the books concerned and a boyish wager made between the two men.¹

The Shepheardes Calender, 1579, closes with the lines addressed to Harvey:

Adieu good *Hobbinol*, that was so true,
Tell *Rosalind*, her *Colin* bids her adieu.

The published letters that passed between the friends in 1579 and 1580 manifest the good understanding between them. A sonnet of Spenser, dated at Dublin, July 18, 1586, expresses warm admiration for "Harvey, the happy above happiest men." When the first three books of *The Faerie Queene* appeared in 1590, they were accompanied by a charming poem of commendation from "Hobynoll," who rejoices that "Collyn" has turned

From rustick tunes, to chaunt heroique deeds.

In the prefatory matter prefixed to Harvey's *Pierces Supererogation*, 1593, Barnabe Barnes mentions "divinest morall Spencer" as the honored friend of Harvey.²

In *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, 1595, Hobbinol still figures as Colin's closest friend:

At last when as he piped had his fill,
He rested him: and sitting then around,
One of those groomes (a iolly groome was he,
As ever piped on an oaten reed,
And lov'd this shepherd dearest in degree,
Hight *Hobbinol*) gan thus to him areed.

[Ll. 10-15.]

It is practically certain that this close, harmonious intimacy between the two men, apparently extending over the last thirty years of Spenser's life, could not have existed without substantial agreement on religious questions. Mr. Higginson shows us that the University of Cambridge was "at all times during Elizabeth's reign a hotbed of Puritanism" (p. 20), and that, during Spenser's stay there,

¹ *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913), p. 23.

² Grosart's *Harvey*, II, 24.

it was, next to London, "the chief centre of Puritan agitation" (p. 30). Spenser had been at Cambridge two and one-third years when, in September, 1571, "Whitgift as Master of Trinity expelled Cartwright from his fellowship in that college on the ground that he had not taken priest's orders."¹ It is probable that the popularity of his opponent was one reason for Whitgift's action. Cartwright was so popular as a speaker that, when his turn came to preach, the windows at St. Mary's had to be taken down, so that the crowd upon the outside might listen.² We have direct evidence that the poet was interested in the agitation that was carried on by Cartwright. In a published letter to Spenser, Harvey, writing from Cambridge, recalls the vestment controversy of former days, in which Cartwright was prominent: "No more adoe aboute *Cappes* and *Surplesses*: Maister Cartwright nighe forgotten."³

With religious controversy so clamorous and omnipresent at Cambridge, it is entirely improbable that Spenser and Harvey could have maintained complete friendship and sympathy unless their religious views were harmonious and upon all fundamental questions substantially identical.

But we are not confined to this reasoning from general probability. There is some corroborative evidence. We know from the letters to Dr. John Young, Master of Pembroke Hall, preserved in Harvey's *Letter-Book*,⁴ that the younger scholar relied upon the elder as his faithful friend. Presumably Dr. Young never failed him. In 1573 some of the Fellows of Pembroke Hall put a technical obstacle in the way of Harvey's obtaining his M.A. degree. Dr. Young was absent at the time; but, says Professor G. C. Moore Smith, he "came down to Cambridge in person, and in a few days crushed all opposition."⁵ This statement is a matter of inference, but is practically certain.

Early in 1578 this same Dr. Young became Bishop of Rochester. As already noted, the new bishop made Spenser his secretary. There is no longer any doubt that the poet praises Young in the September

¹ Higginson, p. 22.

² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

³ *The Oxford Spenser*, p. 621; Grosart's *Harvey*, I, 71.

⁴ Printed for the Camden Society, 1884.

⁵ *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, Introduction, p. 12.

eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender* as "Roffynn," "Roffy." Hobbino! says in line 176:

Colin Clout, I wene, be his [Roffynn's] selfe boye.

I have used this evidence before to show that Spenser was probably a loyal churchman, though a Low-Churchman. I wish to point out here that the friendship of Bishop Young for both Harvey and Spenser furnishes distinct corroboration of the presumption that the two men were agreed in their views about religion. I have yet to show affirmatively what were Harvey's religious opinions.

The evidence to be submitted will prove that Gabriel Harvey was a broad-minded Low-Churchman. I like to call him a Church Puritan. I consider that Professor Padelford is correct in calling Spenser "a consistent advocate of the golden mean in matters ecclesiastical";¹ but it can be plainly demonstrated that the phrase describes Harvey. In 1573, when some of the Fellows of Pembroke Hall, as already noted, sought to prevent Harvey from obtaining the M.A. degree, one of the charges brought against him was that he "had greatly commendid thos whitche men call praecisions and puritanes." This looks like accusing Harvey of being liberal-minded; and the nature of his spirited reply makes it quite probable that there was some ground for the charge. He says:

As for puritanes I wuld fain know what those same puritanes ar and what quallities thai have, that I have so hihly and usually commendid. Let M. Phisician name the persons and then shew that I have praised them, in that respect thai ar puritanes or that ever I have maintainid ani od point of puritanism, or praecisionism mi self, and I shal be contentid to be bard of mi mastership and iointid of my fellowship too, yea and to take ani other sharp meddecine that his lerning shal iudg meetist for sutch a maladi.² Much later Harvey was even suspected of being himself the mysterious Martin Marprelate.³ Thomas Nash ridicules the suggestion that his enemy had "so much wit."⁴

As the Harvey family seem to have been very much of one mind, it is significant that Richard, Gabriel's clerical brother, in his *Lamb of God*, 1590, "seemed disposed to take a middle line between the

¹ *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 106.

² *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey*, pp. 29, 30.

³ In *Pierces Supererogation*, Grosart's *Harvey*, II, 131.

⁴ In *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, McKerrow's *Nash*, III, 138.

bishops and their opponents."¹ Both the *Dictionary of National Biography* and the *Cambridge History of English Literature* consider Richard Harvey to be the probable author of the anonymous pamphlet *Plaine Percevall*.² In this work he is said to be somewhat Puritan in his sympathies.

John Lyly sought to defend the English church from the attacks of Martin Marprelate by retorting in kind to that writer's slangy, lampooning attacks. Lyly's *Pappe with a Hatchet*, appearing anonymously late in 1589, contained a rap at Gabriel Harvey. Harvey wrote a reply entitled *An Advertisement for Papp-hatchett, and Martin Marprelate*. This bears the date of November 5, 1589. It was not published for four years. In 1593 Harvey brought out *Pierces Supererogation* as a part of his verbal war with Thomas Nash. Nearly one-third of this work consists of the foregoing *Advertisement*,³ then first printed. Here in a hundred pages we get a full presentation of the views of Harvey concerning church polity.

I quote a summary and eulogy of this *Advertisement* from Professor G. C. Moore Smith:

[Harvey's reply to Lyly] contains a most serious treatment of the Marprelate controversy, in which Harvey's statesmanship, his independence of ecclesiastical prejudices, and his powers as a writer are seen to the highest advantage. He shows that a perfect system of Church Government is not to be had in a day, that the Primitive Church adapted itself to temporal circumstances, and that the creation of a theocracy represented by ministerial rule in every parish would be intolerable. The better scholar, he says, the colder schismatic. We must have mutual charity or Church and State will be overthrown. Perhaps nothing wiser or more far-sighted was ever written in the whole of the 16th century.⁴

Harvey's discussion certainly deserves hearty commendation, but when we recall that the completed portions of Richard Hooker's great work, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, appeared in 1594 and 1597, and that they were an outcome of this same general controversy, Professor Smith's praise of Harvey's *Advertisement* seems somewhat excessive.

¹ *The Dictionary of National Biography*.

² *Cambridge History of English Literature*, III, 613.

³ Grosart's *Harvey*, II, 124-221.

⁴ Introduction to *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, pp. 58, 59.

It will be best now to let Harvey speak for himself. Since only fifty sets of Grosart's edition of Harvey's works were printed, the passages quoted are not generally accessible.¹

In cases indifferent, or arbitrary, what so equall in generall, as Indifferency: or so requisite in speciall, as conformity to the positive Lawe, to the custome of the Countrey, or to the present occasion? To be perverse, or obstinate without necessary cause, is a peevish folly: when by such a duetyfull and iustificable order of proceeding, as by a sacred League, so infinite Variances, and contentions may be compounded. To the cleane, all thinges are cleane. S. Paule, that layed his foundation like a wise architect, and was a singular frame of divinity, (omnisufficiently furnished to be a Doctour of the Nations, & a Convertour of People) became all unto all, and as it were a Christian Mercury, to winne some. Oh, that his Knowledge, or Zeale were as rife, as his Name: and I would to God, some could learne to behave themselves toward Princes, and Magistrates, as Paul demeaned himselfe, not onely before the King Agrippa, but also before the twoo Romane Procuratours of that Province, Felix, and Festus: whome he entreated in honourable termes, albeit ethnicke governours. Were none more scrupulous, then S. Paul, how easily, and gratusly might divers Confutations bee reconciled, that now rage, like Civill Warres? The chieftest matter in question, is no article of beleife, but a point of pollicy, or government: wherin a Iudiciall Equity being duely observed, what letteth but the particular Lawes, Ordinances, Iniunctions, and whole manner of Iurisdiction, may rest in the disposition of Sovereine Autoritie? [pp. 140-42].

May it therefore please the busiest of those, that debarre Ecclesiasticall persons of all Civill iurisdiction, or temporall function, to consider; how every pettie *Parish*, in England, to the number of about 5200. more, or lesse, may be made a Ierusalem, or Metropolitan Sea, like the noblest Cittie of the Orient, (for so Pliny calleth Ierusalem): how every *Minister* of the sayd Parishes, may be promoted to be an high Priest, and to have a Pontificall Consistorie: how every *Assistant* of that Consistorie, may emprove himselfe an honorable, or worshipfull Senior, according to his reverend calling: . . . how a *Princely and Capitall Court*, and even the high Councell of Parliament, or supreme Tribunall of a Royall Cittie, . . . how such a Princely, and stately Court, should be the patterne of a *Presbitery in a poore Parish*: how the Principalitie or *Pontificalitie* of a *Minister* according to the degenerate Sanedrim, should be sett-upp, when the *Lordship of a Bishop*, or Archbishop, according to their position, is to be pulled-downe: finally how the *supremacie over Kings*, and Emperours should be taken from the highest Priest, or *Pope*, to be bestowed upon an *ordinarie Minister*, or Curate: . . .

¹ The following extracts from the *Advertisement* are found in Grosart's edition of *Harvey*, Vol. II in the Huth Library, 3 vols., 1884-85; but here the modern *s* is used throughout, and the modern distinction between *v* and *u* is observed.

When these points are considered; if withall it be determined by evident demonstration, as cleere as the Sunne, and as invincible as Gods-word, that whatsoever the Apostles did for their time, is immutably perpetuall, and necessarie for all times: and that nothing by way of speciall respect, or present occasion, is left to the ordinaunce, disposition, or provision of the Church, but the strict and precise practise of their Primitive Discipline, according to some Precepts in S. Paules Epistles, and a few Examples in the Actes of the Apostles: *So be it*, must be the suffrage of us, that have no Voyce in the Sanedrim. All is concluded in a fewe pregnant propositions: we shall not neede to trouble, or entangle our wittes with many Articles, Iniunctions, Statutes, or other ordinances: the Generall, Provinciaall, and Episcopall Councils, lost much good labour in their Canons, Decrees, and whatsoever Ecclesiastical Constitutions: the workes of the fathers, and Doctours, howsoever auncient, learned, or Orthodoxall, are little, or nothing worth: infinite studdies, writings, commentaries, treatises, conferences, consultations, disputations, distinctions, conclusions of the most notable Schollers in Christendome, altogither superfluous. Well-worth a fewe resolute Aphorismes; that dispatch more in a word, then could be bouted-out in fifteen hundred yeares; and roundly determine all with an *Upsy-downe*. . . . Now if it seeme as cleere a case in Pollicie, as in Divinitie; that one, and the same Discipline may serve divers, and contrarie formes of regiment, and be as fitt for the head of England, as for the foote of Geneva: The worst is, Aristotles Politiques must be burned for heretiques. But how happie is the age, that in stead of a thousand Positive Lawes, and Lesbian Canons, hath founde one standing Canon of Polycletus, an immutable Law of sacred government? And what a blissefull destinie had the Commonwealth, that must be the Modell of all other Commonwealthes, and the very Center of the Christian world? [pp. 143-47].

M. Calvin, the founder of the plott, (whome Beza stileth the great Calvin) had reason to establish his ministry against Inconstancy, and to fortify himselfe against Faction (as he could best devise, and compasse with the assistance of his French party, and other favorites) by encroaching upon a mechanicall, and mutinous people, from whose variable and fickle mutability he could no otherwise assecure himselfe. As he sensibly found not onely by dayly experiences of their giddy and factious nature, but also by his owne expulsion, and banishment: whome after a little triall, (as it were for a dainety novelty, or sly experiment) they could be content to use as kindly, and loyally, as they had used the old Bishopp, their lawful Prince. Could M. Cartwright, or M. Traverse seaze upon such a Citty, or any like popular towne, Helvetian or other, where Democracy ruleth the rost: they should have some-bodies good leave to provide for their owne security; and to take their best advantage upon tickle Cantons. Some one peradventure in time would canton them well-enough; and give a shrewd pull at a Metropolitan Sea, as souveraine, as the old Bishoprike of Geneva. It were not the

first time, that a Democracy by degrees hath proved an Aristocracy; an Aristocracy degenerated into an Oligarchy; an Oligarchy amounted to a Tyranny, or Principality. . . . I am no pleader for the regiment of the feete over the head, or the government of the stomacke over the hart: surely nothing can be more pernicious in practise, or more miserable in conclusion, then a commanding authority in them, that are borne to obey, ordained to live in private condition, made to follow their occupations, and bound to homage. You that be schollars, moderate your invention with iudgement: and you that be reasonable gentlemen, pacify your selves with reason. If it be an iniury, to enclose Commons; what iustice is it, to lay open enclosures? and if Monarchies must suffer popular states to enioy their free liberties, and amplest fraunchises, without the least infringment, or abridgment: is there no congruence of reason, that popular states should give Monarchies leave, to use their Positive lawes, established orders, and Royall Prerogatives, without disturbance or confutation? [pp. 152-54].

Possession was ever a strong defendant: and a iust title maketh a puissant adversarie. Bishops will gooverne with reputation, when Marr-Prelats must obey with reverence, or resist with contumacie. Errours in doctrine; corruptions in manners; and abuses in offices, would be reformed: but degrees of superioritie, and orders of obedience are needefull in all estates: and especially in the Clergie as necessarie, as the Sunne in the day, or the Moone in the night: or Cock-on-hoope, with a hundred thousand Curates in the world, would proove a mad Discipline. Let Order be the golden rule of proportion; & I am as forward an Admonitioner, as any Precisian in England. If disorder must be the Discipline, and confusion the Reformation, (as without difference of degrees, it must needes) I crave pardon. *Anarchie*, was never yet a good States-man: and *Ataxie*, will ever be a badd Church-man. . . . Equality, in things equall, is a iust Law: but a respective valuation of persons, is the rule of Equity: & they little know, into what incongruities, & absurdities they runne headlong, that are weary of *Geometricall proportion*, or distributive Iustice, in the collation of publike functions, offices, or promotions, civile, or spirituall. God bestoweth his blessings with difference; and teacheth his Lieutenant the Prince, to estimate, and preferre his subiectes accordingly. When better Autors are alledged for equalitie in persons Unequall; I will live, and dye in defence of that equalitie; and honour *Arithmetically Proportion*, as the onely ballance of Iustice, and sole standard of government. Meane-while, they that will-be wiser, then God, and their Prince, may continue a peevish scrupulositie in subscribing to their ordinances; and nurrish a rebellious Contumacie, in refusing their orders. I wish unto my frendes, as unto miselfe: and recomende Learning to discretion, conceit to iudgment, zeale to knowledge, dutie to obedience, confusion to order, Uncertaintie to assurance, and Unlawfull noveltie to lawfull Uniformitie: the sweetest repose, that the Common-wealth, or Church can enioy [pp. 158-60].

Every Miller is ready to convey the water to his owne mill: and neither the high Priestes of Ierusalem, nor the Popes of Roome, nor the Patriarckes of Constantinople, nor the Pastors of Geneva, were ever hastie to binde their owne handes. They that research Antiquities, and inquier into the privities of Practises, shall finde an Act of *Praemunire* is a necessarie Bridle in some cases. The first Bishops of Roome, were undoubtedly vertuous men, and godly Pastors: from Bishops they grew to be Popes: what more reverend, then some of those Bishops; or what more Tyrannical, then some of those Popes? Aaron, and the high-Priestes of Ierusalem, and of other ceremoniall nations, were their glorious Mirrours; and they deemed nothing too-magnificall, or pompous, to breede an Universall reverence of their sacred autoritie, and Hierarchie. We are so farre alienated from imitating, or allowing them, that we cannot abide our owne Bishops; yet withall would have every Minister a Bishop, and would also be fetching a new patterne from old Ierusalem, the moother-sea of the high-Priesthood. So the world (as the manner is) will needes runne-about in a Circle: pull-downe Bishops; set up the Minister; make him Bishop of his Parish, and head of the Consistorie, (call him, how you list, that must be his place): what will become of him within a few generations, but a high Priest in a low Ierusalem, or a great Pope in a small Roome? And then, where is the difference betweene him, and a Bishop, or rather betweene him, and a Pope? [pp. 181-82].

How probable is it, they are now at their very best, and even in the neatest and purest plight of their incorruption, whiles their mindes are abstracted from worldly thoughts, to a high meditation of their supposed-heavenly Reformation: and whiles it necessarily behooveth them, to stand charily and nicely upon the credit of their integritie, sinceritie, precisenesse, godlinesse, Zeale, and other vertues? When such respects are over, and their purpose compassed according to their harts desier; who can tell how they, or their successours may use the Keyes; or how they will besturr them with the Sworde? If Flesh proove not a Pope Ioane; and Bloud a Pope Hildebrand, good enough. Accidents, that have happened, may happen agayne; and all thinges under the Sunne, are subiect to casualtie, mutabilitie, and corruption. At all adventures, it is a brave Position, to maintaine a Soverain, and supreme autoritie in every Consistorie; and to exempt the Minister from superiour Censure; like the high Priest, or greatest Pontiffe. . . . He had neede be a wise, and Conscionable man, that should be a Parliament, or a Chauncerie unto himselfe: and what a furniture of divine perfections were requisite in the Church, where so many Ministers, so many spirituall high Iustices of Oier, and Terminer: and every one a supreme Tribunall, a Synode, a Generall Councell, a Canon Law, a heavenly Law, and Gospel unto himselfe? If no Serpent can come within his Paradise, safe enough. Or were it possible, that the Pastor, (although a man, yet a divine man) should as it were by inheritance, or succession, continue a

Sainct from generation to generation: is it also necessary, that the whole company of the redoubted Seniors, should wage everlasting warre with the flesh, the world, and the Divell; and eternally remaine an incorruptible Areopage, without wound, or scarre? Never such a Colledge, or fraternitie upon Earth, if that be their inviolable order. But God helpe Conceit, that buildeth Churches in the Ayer, and platformeth Disciplines without stayne, or spott.

They complaine of corruptions; and worthily, where Corruptions encroche, (I am no Patron of corruptions): but what a surging sea of corruption would overflow within few yeares, in case the sword of so great and ample autoritie, as that at Ierusalem most capitall, or this at Geneva most redoubted, were putt into the hand of so little capacitie in government, so little discretion in Discipline, so little iudgement in causes, so little moderation in living, so little constancie in saying, or dooing, so little gravitie in behaviour, or so little whatsoever should procure reverence in a Magistrate, or establish good order in a Commonwealth. Travaile thorough ten thousand Parishes in England; and when you have taken a favourable vew of their substantiallest, and sufficientest Aldermen, tell me in good sooth, what a comely shewe they would make in a Consistorie; or with how solemne a presence they would furnish a Councell Table. . . . I deny not, but the short apron may be as honest a man, or as good a Christian, as the long gowne: but methinkes he should scantily be so good a Iudge, or Assistant in doubtfull causes: and I suppose, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam* is as fitt a Proverbe now, as ever it was, since that excellent Painter rebuked that sawcie Cobler [pp. 184-87].

If Bishops-gate be infected, is it impossible for Alders-gate to be attainted? and if neither can be long cleere in an Universall plague of Corruption, what reason hath Zeale to fly from Gods blessing into a warme Sunne: What a wisdom were it, to chaunge for the worse? or what a notorious follie were it, to innovate, without infallible assurance of the better? What Politique state, or considerate people, ever laboured any Alteration, Civill, or Ecclesiasticall, without Pregnant evidence of some singular, or notable Good, as certaine in consequence, as important in estimation? To be short, . . . had Martin his lust, or Penry his wish, or Udal his mynde, or Browne his will, or Ket his phansie, or Barrow his pleasure, or Greenwood his harts-desire, or the freshest Practitioners their longing, (even to be Iudges of the Consistorie, or Fathers Conscript of Senate, or *Domine fac totum*, or themselves wott not what); there might fall-out five hundred practicable cases, and a thousand disputable questions in a yeare, (the world must be reframed anew, or such points decided) wherewith they never disquieted their braynes, and wherein the learnedest of them could not say A. to the Arches, or B. to a Battledore. If the graver motioners of Discipline (who no doubt are learned men, and might be wiser: but M. Travers, M. Cartwright, Doctour Chapman, and all the

grayer heads begin to be stale with these Noovellists) have bethought themselves upon all cases, and cautels in Practise, of whatsoever nature, and have thorowly provided against all possible mischieffs, inconveniences, and irregularities, as well future, as present; I am glad they come so well prepared: surely some of the earnestest and egest sollicitours, are not yet so furnished [pp. 207-8].

Hans Berli, at the close of his full and able discussion of the work of Gabriel Harvey, tells us: "Er war Humanist und Puritaner."¹ But simply to call him a Puritan leaves many questions unanswered. He was a broad-minded Low-Churchman, accepting and defending the episcopal system, but with no illusions about it, and no extreme views. At times he shows a liberality of mind and a grasp of fundamental questions that remind us of Bishop Hooker himself.

There can be little doubt that Spenser's position was substantially identical with that of Harvey. The poet appears to have been more aggressively hostile than his friend to abuses in the church. I believe that the intensity of Spenser's reforming zeal has helped to mislead some careful students as to his fundamental position.

ALBERT H. TOLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ *Gabriel Harvey, der Dichter-freund und Kritiker*, Dissertation (Zürich, 1913), p. 146.